



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

“AMERICANISM,” TRUE AND FALSE.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM BARRY, D. D.

It has been a subject of surprise to many Americans that a controversy which was carried on in France and Italy, and which has now been decided at Rome, should have borne the title of “Americanism.” What is the matter in dispute? How did it arise? And under what circumstances has Pope Leo XIII. judged it his duty to publish, in a solemn letter addressed to Cardinal Gibbons, as the representative of the American Hierarchy, that he “cannot approve of those opinions which, taken altogether, certain persons term” by that name. These are questions as momentous as they are reasonable. They deserve an answer; and in the following pages we shall make an attempt to give in outline the story of this chapter in recent events, as well as some explanation of the issues involved. It will then, we trust, be clear that there is a noble and necessary use of the word “Americanism,” against which Pope Leo does not in any way set his face; while there is another, not necessary and far from noble, for which those are responsible who have employed it in a sense entirely foreign to the American people, but with a purpose which we shall do our best to unravel as we proceed.

The papal letter is an instruction,—one might almost call it a sermon,—in Catholic doctrine. But the incidents which led up to it have a strong political cast. For Americans, happily removed from the race-hatreds and inherited feuds which make of the continent of Europe a battlefield and an armed camp, it is not, perhaps, easy to take in so perplexed a situation. Yet, in fairness to their Catholic fellow-citizens, who have always deserved well of the Republic, they may not be unwilling to hear the account of this last struggle between Democracy on the one hand, and Imperialism on the other. Such are, in truth, the issues at stake.

Nor has Leo XIII. done anything more calculated to fulfill his programme of reconciliation than when he swept aside, with majestic insistence, the clouds of misunderstanding which had been conjured up by men who detest every form of free government, and who dreamt that they could ruin the leaders of Catholicism in the United States, by fastening on them an imputation of unsound and heretical teaching. That effort has been foiled. The Pope condemns no American prelate; he is careful not to take upon himself the burden of baptizing as American, opinions which run counter to elementary Christian principles; nay, he guards himself explicitly against disowning the word itself, in a passage that will long be cited as the Magna Charta of American Catholic freedom. "If by that name," he writes, "are to be understood certain admirable qualities of mind which adorn the American people, as other nations have their own gifts; and again, if thereby is meant your political condition, and the laws and customs which you enjoy, there is no reason at all to take exception to it." But precisely this, and no other, has been the Americanism of Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Ireland, Archbishop Keane, and those associated with them, who for years have been insisting that, between the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Catholic Church, not only does there exist no opposition, but there is a deep and Providential harmony. This, too, was the key note of Isaac Hecker's life, the lesson which he was ever repeating, and his distinctive text as a religious philosopher contemplating the task and the destiny of nations. It has now been affirmed by the Head of the Church, under circumstances in which every human influence had been brought to bear upon him, in the hope that he would unsay or soften, or in some degree modify what his legate, Cardinal Satolli, had proclaimed at Chicago, "Go forward, in one hand bearing the Book of Christian truth, and in the other the Constitution of the United States."*

If this be so, men will ask, how comes a system of false doctrine to have thrust itself in the way, and usurped a name which it desecrates? That is a long but not a doubtful story. We know the writers who have done this thing; we know why they have done it. The literature—if a series of violent and uncritical diatribes may be so termed—in which their platform lies open

*Satolli: "Loyalty to Church and State," original American edition, p. 150.

to the world, can be read in more than one language; and melancholy reading it is.

To comprehend how it arose, we must look back to the year 1887, or even earlier, and take a view of the Papal policy on both sides of the Atlantic. The starting point is fixed by those measures, which Pope Leo designed as a means of reconciling the church with the French Republic.

Thereby he gave the death-blow to Legitimism,—that singular Jacobite apparition in the nineteenth century,—but by the same stroke he created the "Irreconcilables," *les refractaires*, who declined his guidance and held on in their entrenched isolation. It was whispered in their councils that the Pope had been brought round to Democracy by American prelates, on whom he was then showering his favors. We all remember the episode of the "Knights of Labor," saved from condemnation by the Cardinal of Baltimore. Then came the setting up of a University at Washington; the many gracious acts which accompanied the centenary of the American church, and the despatch of a Papal delegate to the United States. Every sign foreboded a new and Democratic era. Old things were passing away.

But there was a mighty Power across the Rhine, which looked on with rage and misgiving at a change so full of danger to its own *prestige*. Was Europe going to be Republican, and the Pope to bless popular constitutions? Words of warning, of menace, escaped from Imperial lips. In a celebrated interview at the Vatican, as is credibly reported, the young ruler of Germany, who had learned his lesson well, intimated that he had no wish to renew the *Kulturkampf*, but the Pope must not strengthen the hands of Democracy, or consequences would follow. We have seen, during the late war, who was the most determined antagonist of the United States, short of actual hostilities; and now it is said that the stream of German emigration is to be guided from New York to South America,—signs these, which cannot be misconstrued, of an uneasy feeling at Berlin that the great Western Republic is infecting all nations with its passion for free institutions and its hatred of an absolute, even though paternal, government, such as William II. exercises *von Gottes Gnaden*. Thus in Germany was the motive-power, in France the material, of an assault upon American principles, with Rome and the Papacy as a possible conquest,—all in the interests of Imperialism.

Much more could be stated which, one day, will doubtless come to light. But enough is here set down to give the reader some indication of causes, deep and formidable, which will account for an explosion so sudden, at three different centres, of fury against "Americanism," as a disturber of European peace. The Legitimist, the Imperialist, "the man of yesterday"—the party which in France has pursued Dreyfus to extermination; which in Italy is accused of coquetting with Socialists to overturn the monarchy; which has learned nothing and forgotten nothing since 1848—saw itself confronted with a new enemy, and that enemy America. The Franco-Latin world had been shaken to its foundations by the triumph of an English-speaking race over Spain in Cuba. And if anything was to be undertaken by way of safeguard or revenge, American Catholics stood in the front, the first line of battle, and resting on Rome. At Rome, accordingly, they have been assailed.

But the focus of debate was in Paris. Ever since the Pope had urged French Catholics to rally round the Third Republic and make the best of it, a movement had been going on which, while drawing to itself many of the younger clergy and some of the more eminent, had called forth a reaction as determined as it was powerful in the press and elsewhere. The "young Catholics" were bent on reconciliation wherever it was compatible with orthodox principles; and though, in the province of Bible criticism or historical investigation, they could not look to America for guidance,—since America is not the home of such studies,—yet in a certain largeness of spirit, in a temper at once candid and virile, it did appear to them that the New World set them an example. There was an outburst of enthusiasm, not unlike the Anglomania of a century ago, for American ideas and persons. Archbishop Ireland, who is an eloquent French orator, was requested to explain before an audience not unworthy of him, how it came to pass that the Church flourished across the Atlantic so marvellously, and what was the secret of its success. He replied by pointing to the freedom from state interference in matters of religion, or, as we may say, the Church's happy self-government, under a constitution which made Cæsarism impossible. He did not touch on the burning question of the Concordat. Everyone is aware that, by a single vote and in one sitting, the French Chamber could suppress what is termed "*le budget des cultes*," in other words, it might, and perhaps will, some day or other, disendow

if not disestablish the Church in France, without warning or remorse. But, evidently, on so delicate a theme, neither Archbishop Ireland nor any foreign Catholic could offer an opinion.

In the boundless deluge of pamphlets and articles which have strewn the Paris boulevards since Americanism became a fashionable topic, we shall find no contributions from Americans. The parties to this quarrel were French, Belgian, Italian or German. The American Bishops whose names have been most frequently shot at during this battle have kept silence. M. l'Abbé Klein did, indeed, translate into French the "Discourses" of Archbishop Ireland. By and by, a French version, compressed and not in all respects accurate, of the "Life of Father Hecker," was given to the world anonymously, with a preface from M. Klein's pen. The influence of these translations was certainly great. Unhappily, also, in passing from an English to a continental medium, phrases and ideas which we understand at home in one sense, and that perfectly innocent, were taken to imply another system, with which they had nothing in common. Belonging to the sphere of practice, they were seized upon by theorists and carried up into the region of dogma; politics were transformed to pure theology; the expedient was termed the absolute; and misunderstandings were multiplied by the fatal French habit which constructs on a basis all but imaginary an edifice wholly hypothetical. For these things Americans are not to blame; and good sense can only shrug its shoulders when logic is employed to refute experience, or to read into English authors a meaning which is unknown to our cast of thought and is merely metaphysical.

For the extravagances, aberrations, and headlong flights of rhetoric, therefore, in which either of these French parties have chosen to indulge, they alone are responsible. Yet some connected with America, doubtless, were behind the journalists who stirred up a quarrel, in semblance dogmatic or spiritual, though in fact as mundane as politics could make it. Interests were clothed in the garb of principles. Nor were personalities long absent. When the *Univers* took Pope Leo's advice and acknowledged the Republic, a new journal was started, *refractaire* to the backbone, which, with unconscious humor, called itself *La Vérité*. In the columns of this newspaper, as of others like it, Americanizers, Jews, and Freemasons are classed together; the abuse of

logic is cultivated as a fine art; and so amazing are the delusions which it fosters that an Englishman, reading it, cannot be surprised when he is told that, in such an atmosphere, the imposture of Diana Vaughan sprang up to its shameful height. Only those who are well acquainted with this curious kind of journalism,—it is sixty or seventy years old,—can form an idea of the fantastic judgments which it is ever putting forth on men and things.* There has long been indigenous to France an English legend; the time seemed ripe for an American one. We may read it in the pages of M. l'Abbé Charles Maignen, whose pamphlet, entitled "*Le Père Hecker, est-il un Saint?*" gave the signal for an assault which was followed up in all the organs of Legitimism.

Archbishop Ireland, as being loyal to American Democracy, could never be put down nor his credit taken away. But could not the attempt be made to fasten upon him, Archbishop Keane, and Cardinal Gibbons the imputation of unsound doctrine? All these were champions of liberty,—the good old English freedom which has its roots in the Catholic Middle Ages, and is the cornerstone of American institutions. Liberty might be rendered into French as "lawlessness," into Italian as "Liberalism,"—anarchy in conduct, free-thinking in dogma,—and the feat was accomplished. In what did the true Americanism consist? In this, according to the Archbishop of St. Paul, that there is nothing in the Constitution which a Catholic may not accept; that he does not aim at pulling down the smallest part of the edifice set up by Washington and his successors; that he has never dreamt of a political ascendancy (were it even possible) which would deprive any citizen, on religious grounds, of his rights; that he is ready to live and die with America and for America. Moreover, with Cardinal Satolli, he recognizes that the Americans are, on the whole, a Christian nation; he respects their virtues; he urges upon his fellow Catholics to rival them in manliness, sobriety, honest public service; and he knows very well how pressing is the need of such exhortation, when the millions of Europe are flung without education or guidance upon the American shore. He does not talk of ideal states and conditions no longer existing around him, but of this Western world in which his lot is cast. If the "young French," or any others, believe that their country is passing into

* See its latest specimen—a model of reasoning *à rebours*: "*L'Americanisme et l'Anathème*," by M. l'Abbé Delassus, directeur de la *Semaine Religieuse de Cambrai*.

a similar phase and stands in need of the like counsels, let them see to it; that is their concern. Nor can he refuse to tell them what methods have succeeded best with him, although fully aware that the Continental nations seldom possess the temper of the men that among ourselves have built up a true religious and social peace. Not a single American has ever thought of dictating to French or Italians their political programme. If there is something in the air favorable to his ideas, he cannot help it; he would not if he could. Suppose the older social conditions of Europe doomed to disappear; shall an American regret their passing? But, in his own mind, Religion is safe; he feels it and he glories in it.

Safe, however, on one condition; it must not seem to endanger the Constitution. Old Protestant hatred still breeds men, neither few nor feeble, who are straining their utmost to abolish the Catholic free schools, to tax their charitable foundations, to ostracize their candidates for office. And these, if they could give momentum to their prejudices by the cry that "Catholics are traitors," would perhaps achieve a good part of their desire. That is why the Bishops in question have maintained, and do maintain, with Hecker and Brownson,—nay, with Cardinal Satolli and the Pope himself,—that, in the words of the Papal delegate, "the State, in so far as it is free and progressive, need fear nothing from the Church; but, on the contrary, ought to expect great benefit from it." And again they insist, as he did in 1893, that "a study of the history of America, the constitutional organization of our Government, and the sentiments of its founders, as expressed in the writings of Washington and our other great men, only confirm the impression that the life and essence of our institutions are in perfect harmony with the sentiments of Leo XIII. on the subject of human liberty."*

Such is the true Americanism. Now for the false. It has been constructed by men like M. Maignen, according to a simple but effective recipe, which consists in taking words apart from their drift and context, reading into them the maximum of false interpretation which they will bear, mingling therewith any extravagances which have been uttered by persons who have no sort of connection with the parties accused, and then crying triumphantly: "Behold the latest plot against Rome!" M. Maignen finds

*Satolli, pp. 75, 213.

that Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland express their admiration for Isaac Hecker as an exemplary priest and sound American. It follows, by the rules of his peculiar logic, that they agree in every particle with Hecker's mysticism, to which they make no reference. Cardinal Gibbons, with the assent of his colleagues, the American Archbishops, is present at the Congress of Religions in Chicago, and opens it with prayer. It follows that he is "indifferent" in matters of faith, and holds every religion to be as good as his own. Archbishop Keane reads a philosophical essay on the same occasion, in which he traces the idea of the Incarnation through various imperfect phases in heathen cults, until it is realized and wins the homage of mankind in the Person of Christ. At once he is set down as preaching a monstrous form of "evolution;" he becomes the confederate of a certain "Romanus" whose articles are unknown to him, and whose temper and teaching he would be the first to repudiate. No matter; by dexterous,—or shall we say, unscrupulous?—dovetailing into one of all these scattered elements, an "American" theology is built up, which disowns the supernatural, sacrifices Catholic doctrine to the spirit of the age, and is the harbinger of Antichrist. Having written his book, M. Maignen seeks an *Imprimatur* from the Cardinal at Paris. Cardinal Richard refuses it. He applies to Father Lepidi, Master of the Sacred Palace in Rome; and Father Lepidi allows his volume, reeking with personal charges against members of the Hierarchy, to appear in the capital of Christendom, armed with his licence.

It was inevitable that Archbishop Keane, who was there on the spot, should protest to the authorities against a defamatory libel. He had suffered already for his Americanism, though it was not mystical, and was simply patriotic. His brilliant career as Rector of Washington University had been brought to an end by machinations of which this is not the place to tell the story. Still, he had not opened his lips in self defence. He now urged upon the Secretary, Cardinal Rampolla, that an *Imprimatur* to M. Maignen's book, publicly given, should be publicly withdrawn. The Cardinal assured him that it was not his doing, or the Holy Father's; that no one in Rome suspected Mgr. Keane of heterodoxy, and that Father Lepidi had acted on his own judgment. Father Lepidi declared that a licence to print was no approbation; it merely signified that the book did not seem to teach anything

contrary to faith or morals. The Archbishop replied that a series of unfounded charges against members of the Episcopate seemed to him *contra bonos mores*; and he insisted that either he was the victim of calumny, or else unfit to be tolerated within the pale of Catholicism. The Imprimatur was not withdrawn.

Two books were now prominently in question,—the French "Life of Father Hecker," with its preface by M. l'Abbé Klein, and the pamphlet issued by M. Maignen, in which, as it seems, had been embodied articles written by M. Peries, formerly a professor at Washington, and not on the best terms with the authorities who had dismissed him. The sum of their contention was that Hecker, and with him all the Americanizers, had fallen into gross heresy on the subject of the inward life and the relation of individuals to the Church; moreover, that they had endeavored to make converts by keeping back essential portions of the creed; that they set the natural virtues above the supernatural; that they upheld, in principle, the separation of Church and State; that they despised religious vows; were bent on overthrowing the religious orders as useless and unsuited to the age; and constituted an extreme and deadly peril to Catholicism, which must be met immediately.

There is much in a name; there is more in an indictment so cunningly fashioned as to alarm many interests and unite their partisans against a supposed enemy. "Americanism" had become a war cry. The Legitimist joined with the Imperialist; some bishops were terror stricken by the defection of a number of priests in France, and by the tactics of M. Charbonnel, who had made a tumultuous exit from the sanctuary; theologians asked whether the mysticism of the "Life of Hecker" was not exaggerated; among the religious orders some believed that their vows were looked down upon and their existence threatened. The Society of Jesus opened fire upon "Liberalism," an ancient enemy; the Dominicans were solicitous for the credit of the Master of the Sacred Palace. There was another palace in Rome, too, that of the Spanish Embassy, whose tenants were not idle. The high Roman society was led by Spaniards, and its tone was violent against America. M. Maignen received a letter of praise from Cardinal Satolli. To a second Cardinal was attributed a *brochure* which did not spare American ideas. The doctrinal campaign was proceeding vigorously in the Latin countries; but while the

Bishops of Nancy and Annecy joined in it, the Archbishops and Cardinal Gibbons, who had been so freely dealt with, held their peace.

It is, perhaps, time to say a word concerning the "Life of Father Hecker," now become the centre of attack. Yet not very many are needed. When the present writer took occasion to review it, on its first appearance in English, in 1892, he certainly did not see in its pages the errors which would have consigned it to penal fires. It then bore the Imprimatur of Archbishop Corrigan. For himself, he thought Isaac Hecker a man of rare simplicity and religious earnestness, who was led on by obedience to the light within, until he had found the Church and submitted himself to it, body and soul. Hecker was German by descent, and mystic by temperament. He wrote a popular style, without the technicalities of the professor, and his meaning must be gathered from the whole of his publications, nor should one part be taken and another left. It is inconceivable that a man who had always on his lips the word "criterion," or touchstone, to designate the Church's function in regard to spiritual experience, can have meant to disown her authority. As little can we imagine that one who was ever telling men to "find the synthesis,"—that is to say, the true union of inward life and outward ordinance,—and pointing to Catholicism as its fulfilment, should have stultified his reasoning and confounded his practice by leaving individuals to follow their private judgment, unchecked by bishop or confessor. Even M. Maignen quotes the aphorism in which he sums up his general rule of conduct; "the Holy Spirit," he declares, "is the immediate guide of the soul in the way of salvation and sanctification; and the criterion or sign that the soul is guided by the Holy Spirit, is its prompt obedience to the authority of the Church."*

Explicit enough, one would say, were any language capable of resisting a malign interpretation. But Hecker's mystical views did not, in any case, attain the publicity, or exert the influence on his fellow-countrymen which some French writers have attributed to them. They were his private opinions, and nothing more. As regards the catch-word "Americanism," though it occurs in the "Life," its origin must be sought elsewhere. It came up, we are told, during the course of that movement, in 1884 and the fol-

*Maignen, p. 111.

lowing years, which was associated with the name of Cahensly. Some German emigrants to the United States,—a section, not the whole of them,—petitioned at Rome for German-speaking Bishops, and demanded a sort of local autonomy, as if meaning to remain separate, they and their children, from the country which had opened its arms to them. There was a great outcry. Archbishop Ireland, pleading for the unity of Church and people, maintained that the newcomers must "Americanize" themselves; and, thanks to his efforts, combined with those of other prelates, and to a strong public opinion, the party of separation was defeated. A German Catholic Church in the States became impossible. But, in the disputes which followed, German critics of the Archbishop retorted upon him the name of "Americanism" as a stigma; nor did they fail to daub it over with inventions of their own. Thus it grew to be an ambiguous formula, patriotic on the lips of those who employed it as a synonym for loyalty to the Constitution, but redolent of "Liberalism" and all evil things when the extreme German party used it as a weapon of offence. Now, "Liberalism," as understood in Rome, is a false doctrine, anti-Christian and subversive. Nor had Democracy itself, for many years, a grateful sound in the ears of men who sighed for the absolute governments which a Revolution had overthrown. Yet the Church, by her theologians, had affirmed, as did Cardinal Satolli, that "Democracy is the best balancing between authority and liberty."* It could not be laid under anathema. Nor could freedom, or the "civic virtues," or the rights of conscience, or the duty of individual and social development. What, then, could be done by the opponents of Democracy? They could give the name of "Americanism" to a false system of doctrine and implore the Holy See to condemn that. So the name would lose its honor; the tide of democratic progress would be turned back; and between Catholics in the United States and the Constitution a great gulf would be fixed. As in Europe, so in America, there would be citizens holding aloof from State service, or not allowed to share in it, on the ground of their unconquerable hostility to the laws under which they were living. And native Americans would be compelled to remodel their fundamental statutes, or to see in Catholics an alien people and shut them out from office and authority.

*Satolli, p. 260.

The Irreconcilables of Europe do not shrink from creating or perpetuating this state of things. They will live and die in opposition, however loudly the Pope may urge them to take their share in public affairs. It is their business to exaggerate, to sow dissension, to shut every avenue which might lead to social peace. For they reason that if things can be brought to their worst, they will mend. Their policy is one of catastrophe and disaster. If Hecker's "Life" had not been given in French, they must have invented some other opportunity for dragging before a church tribunal the democratic leaders whom they feared as well as hated. At the Congress of Fribourg, in 1897, Mgr. O'Connell, an American prelate resident in Rome, published, in a short essay, some observations upon "Americanism, a new idea in the Life of Father Hecker," calling attention, not to any mystical doctrines, but to the character and consequences of American law, as contrasted with the Imperial Roman. He described the flourishing condition of Catholics in the United States, and went on to say that they enjoyed there a form of government at least as favorable to the Church as any on the continent of Europe. These were matters of experience, patent to all. But the Irreconcilables care nothing for experience. They fastened eagerly on the identification suggested between Hecker, the mystic and religious, whom they were assailing, and "Americanism" as a "new idea." Mgr. O'Connell doubtless meant that the idea of liberty, found in our ancient laws, was new to them. But they, transforming politics to theology, drew up their indictment. M. Maignen's book came out in Rome as the manifesto of orthodox France against heretical America.

The parties, we have said, on one side were Imperialists, Spaniards, men of various orders in religion, and good people alarmed by symptoms of change in France, and a general apprehension that infidelity was at the doors. Who were on the other? American Catholics, attached to their Constitution, innocent of dogmatic or mystic novelties, and anxious only to enjoy their Providential freedom. The Pope was called upon, not by them,—for what had they done that could deserve his censure?—but by the alarmists of every shade, who clamored for a pronouncement which, as they intended, should stop the mouth of patriotic Archbishops and make of Democracy a thing forbid. Rumors filled the air. It was said that the French, perhaps even the English,

"Life of Hecker," would be pilloried in the *Index*; and then that Pope Leo had reserved the matter to himself; that he was writing a letter which would decide it; that the letter was written and on the point of being despatched. Mgr. O'Connell, after a conversation with Father Lepidi, sent him a brief note in which, distinguishing between the real political Americanism defended by himself at Fribourg, and the figment conjured up by M. Maignen, he affirmed his former conviction, but rejected this new-fangled heresy as despicable. His letter was so given to the world as to make it appear that he had rejected "Americanism" and taken back his argument.

The words which Mgr. O'Connell did write are so much to the purpose that we will venture to translate them. He had said, in his translated letter, "as regards that which people call 'Heckerism,' or religious Americanism, not only have I no concern with it, but I despise it." Three days later, July 14, 1898, he developed this theme as follows: "They (the anti-Americans) talk first of something that they call religious Americanism, the scope of which is to bring into the Church a new phase of religion and dogma, after the fashion of an article written, as is supposed, by an Englishman, who signs himself 'Romanus,' under the heading of 'Liberal Catholicism,' and published in the 'Contemporary Review.' Then they put forward a particular kind of religious subjectivism in all its branches, and call that 'Heckerism.' They will do their best to fasten these two things upon us. Now, I must tell you, Very Reverend Father, for myself, that not only have I nothing to do with anything of the sort, but that I look upon it all as stupid and despicable; and I am convinced that every good Catholic in America would say as much, were he examined on the subject."*

At last, Archbishop Ireland appeared in Rome. It is commonly said that in preparing what was afterwards published by Leo XIII.—the Brief which begins "*Testem benevolentiae*"—the Holy Father took as his ministers, Cardinal Satolli and Cardinal Mazzella, both of whom had resided in the United States. Equally common is the report that none of the American Hierarchy was called into consultation; while certain French prelates, like Mgr. Turinaz, had expressed themselves emphatically on the subject of Americanism. The Archbishop of St. Paul made his

*Text in Delassus, pp. 304-305.

protest. He asked to see the text of the letter prepared. But it did not fall under his eyes until it was published in the "*Osservatore Romano*." Archbishop Keane laid down, in extremely clear language, to Father Lepidi and Cardinal Rampolla, the meaning which he, and those like-minded with him, had always put on the word,—a meaning not doctrinal but political. The chief of the American Episcopate, Cardinal Gibbons, wrote a letter to the Pope which is said greatly to have affected His Holiness, and in that letter the Cardinal denied that any prelate in the United States had held such views as were attributed to some of them during this controversy. When, under such circumstances, the Brief was made public, Cardinal Rampolla assured the Archbishop of St. Paul that it had been so framed as not to touch him; and the Archbishop replied that he wanted no more. Adhesions poured in from every side,—from the Paulist Fathers, Archbishop Keane, M. l'Abbé Klein, and from the Archbishop of New York. The incident was closed without a single defection or the least token of revolt. Let us ask ourselves what is implied in so profound a peace, where heresies had been imputed which, had they had any life in them, must have rent Christendom asunder?

First, it is remarkable that while certain Archbishops and a Roman Cardinal were charged by name with pernicious views in so many journals, none was sent for by the Holy Father, and no explanations were asked of them. Two alternatives, and two only, are therefore conceivable. Either they were so manifestly orthodox that the judgment of the Holy Father did not in any way strike at them; or they were condemned by implication, without a hearing, or any opportunity of defence,—in secret, and on the evidence of avowed enemies. The latter alternative is simply incredible. If there be a writer in Europe who will charge the Supreme Judge of Christendom with conduct so atrocious, we do not envy that man. He is doing his best to stain the memory of Leo XIII. with a moral assassination. But his contention is hollow and false. Where no trial has taken place, no sentence can be pronounced. Cardinal Rampolla's assurances to the prelates in question leave them unscathed and secure. They never taught the amazing errors which need only to be recited in order to be flung contemptuously aside by every Catholic; for, indeed, as Mgr. O'Connell wrote, they are "despicable" in their wanton denial of

truths, which we have always known, as well as abhorrent to the religious instinct of all of us. Let them go back whence they came, to the Father of Lies.

But, secondly, the Papal document does not condemn Isaac Hecker. It passes no judgment on the "Life." Much has been said and done to twist into a sentence against the man, or his English biography, words most carefully framed so as to rule out of court these unprofitable wranglings. "It is known to you," writes Pope Leo, "that the Book of the Life of I. Hecker,—especially owing to those who have undertaken to translate or interpret the same in a foreign tongue,—has excited not a little controversy, on account of opinions brought in touching the method of the Christian life." That is all. "Opinions brought in,"—by whom or in whose pages, the Pope does not determine. And criticism of the volume would here be quite out of place. For we are required to affirm, not that Hecker said certain things, but that, whoever said them, they are contrary to the Church's teaching;—which we do with all our heart. We may take our own view of the personal and historical question: that which the Holy See insists upon is the doctrinal.

Again, it is manifest that, while expressing their full and unreserved assent to the Papal pronouncement, neither Archbishop Ireland nor Archbishop Keane has retracted one iota of that patriotic and political Americanism, so eloquently proclaimed by Cardinal Satolli when he was Pope Leo's Delegate in Washington, and their constant teaching. Both repudiate the false Americanism made up of errors and extravagances, which, as the Archbishop of New York observes, had endeavored to find a footing under that specious name. And he, too, implies that the word has a proper and lawful use. John Ireland, who has fought so bravely on behalf of a loyal Catholic people, devoted alike to Church and Constitution, is therefore well warranted in exclaiming that "to-day there is light." Not even M. Maignen can henceforth charge the great Archbishop of the West, or his friends and fellow-workers, with errors they denounce and abhor. That they never held them is known, best of all, to every one who has shared their counsels, or seen their daily exertions to plant the Catholic religion in men's hearts, and restore to it the social and civilizing influence which, for the good of mankind, it should ever wield. Leo XIII. affirms the unity of Church and doctrine;

the privileges and services of the religious orders; the supernatural as above the natural; obedience to authority; the need of wise direction; and the claim of Catholicism to be recognized as the one Divine Revelation by individuals and society. It is well. These things have always been dear to the men whom journals calling themselves Christian would associate in a secret alliance with the revolutionary forces of Europe. But, delusions swept away, the prospect of the future lies before us, and it is exceedingly fair.

The nations of the North and South are drawing together; America has a great mission; Democracy is the new track upon which history will pursue its course. The English-speaking races have energy, freedom, science, but also sects and divisions, and need of religious unity. The French and Latin have an unbroken Christian past, the forms and doctrines of the faith; besides art and manners, and a certain beauty of life, as fascinating as it is simple. Will the abounding energy be always separated from the gracious forms? We cannot believe it. The old Religion, the true Religion of Humanity, is indispensable to real progress. Once get rid of the political bugbear, and we are in sight of a great Eirenicon, or message of peace; for under democratic social conditions the Church can flourish, as the home and sanctuary of the Divine Spirit. If we study Pope Leo's encyclicals as a whole, they offer us this hope of reconciliation. Bishops, clergy, laity, religious, all may claim their share in the movement. When we speak of Christendom, we mean the genuine historical Church; in one word, Catholicism; when of Democracy, we mean self-government, as in Washington and Lincoln. It will be to the everlasting honor of prelates like Ireland, Keane and Gibbons, that they have shown the world how they can be at once fervent Catholics and loyal Americans. If that is Americanism, they certainly have Leo. XIII. for their master. They can afford to be misunderstood while their work prospers. But henceforth, though many assail, none will misunderstand them. By their previous efforts the danger of warring Catholic communities in America has been averted; their adhesion to the Papal Letter is but an avowal of what they have always cherished. They may smile now at the Irreconcilables; and who can question that their great Motherland will take them to her heart of hearts? For in the name of America they have undergone a moral martyrdom.

Last of all, the utter quietness with which in the United States the Pope's letter has been received, is no slight argument in favor of those who, like Bishop Horstmann, of Cleveland, have assured the Roman authorities that errors touching the method of the Christian life had not been spread among their clergy or people. Archbishop Ireland repels as a slander the abuse which in Europe has dishonored a noble name; and the fact of so immediate and universal an adhesion speaks for itself. There was no difficulty in assenting, for no article of faith had been denied, nor any laudable practice called in question. And so the Holy Father writes confidently that if, by Americanism, “be meant the doctrines” on which he has animadverted, “can there be a doubt that our Venerable Brethren, the Bishops of America, will repudiate and condemn it as the greatest insult to themselves and all their people?” That is precisely what has come to pass. *Causa finita est.* But there always was, there now is acknowledged by the Pope himself to be, a true Americanism, and it will march to victory under the banner of Leo XIII.

WILLIAM BARRY.